Historic, archived document

Do not assume content reflects current scientific knowledge, policies, or practices.

United States Department of Agriculture

Extension Service Circular 355 March 1941

LIBRARY OF THE
OFFICE OF EXPERIMENT STATIONS
APR 25 1941
EXPERIMENT STATION FILE

A THEORY OF AGRICULTURAL DEMOCRACY 1/

By
M. L. Wilson
Director of Extension Work

HIGH LIGHTS

THE CULTURAL PATTERN OF DEMOCRACY involves interaction of the processes of education, the application of science through production technology, the administrative processes of government, the economic processes of exchange and distribution.

INTELLIGENT PARTICIPATION is one of the fundamental elements of the democratic pattern of culture. The freedom of individuals in the democratic pattern is not the freedom of anarchy.

AGRICULTURAL DEMOCRACY has become a common symbol in speech and writing within the past decade. It is an outgrowth of the struggle for agricultural equality led by the national farm organizations since the days of the first McNary-Haugen Bill. It had its practical beginning in the first AAA program.

GENERAL PRINCIPLES OF AGRICULTURAL DEMOCRACY are: (a) Decentralized local administration through farmer committeemen; (b) the use of referendums in determining certain administrative policies, such as marketing quotas; (c) the use of group discussion and adult education to promote intelligent participation in the administration of the various farm programs; (d) cooperative planning in program formulation.

DEVELOPMENT OF ADMINISTRATIVE SCIENCE is necessary. Much thought is being given to the question of where the different phases of administration should take place, i.e., on the county, State, or Federal level. Political science departments of our colleges and universities thus face opportunities similar to those of the economics departments in the years before the special field of agricultural economics was developed.

TODAY'S PROBLEM IN DEVELOPING AGRICULTURAL DEMOCRACY is to maintain the functioning principles of the New England town meeting with 6¼ million farmers in a complicated society of 130,000,000 people.

1/ An address before the American Political Science Association, Chicago, Ill., December 28, 1940.

CONTENTS

Page

Since ancient times people have believed in the innate goodness of rural life..... 3

Farm debates of twenties brought on agricultural democracy..... 3

Participating farmers administer programs locally..... 5

Referendums play important part..... 6

Discussion and participation are vital to democratic process..... 8

Agricultural extension work is a cooperative educational enterprise..... 10

Numerous processes interact in a particular culture or society..... 11

The problem of modern agriculture is to maintain the functioning principles of the town meeting..... 14

Administrative science looms important..... 17

What are some of the pitfalls of agricultural democracy? 18

DISTRIBUTION.- A copy of this circular has been sent to each extension director; State leader in county agricultural, home demonstration, and 4-H Club work; extension economist; agricultural-college library and experiment-station library.

420-41

A THEORY OF AGRICULTURAL DEMOCRACY

Since ancient times people have believed in the innate goodness of rural life.

There is traditional pride among farm people in their philosophy of democracy and in the form in which it expresses itself. Because of particular elements inherent in rural society and rural environment, farmers possess a deep-seated inclination toward democratic behavior.

This is an old truth.-- the belief that there is an innate goodness in the rural way of life. It can be traced from the ancients to the present. The Greek poets and the writers of the Old Testament extolled the virtues of the husbandman.

It was natural when we were a simple agricultural nation to associate democracy with agriculture. It was in this vein that Jefferson wrote: "I think our governments will remain virtuous for many centuries, as long as they are chiefly agricultural; and this will be as long as there shall be vacant lands in any part of America. When they get piled upon one another in large cities, as in Europe, they will become corrupt as in Europe."

It is easy to collect an array of similar quotations from the writings of familiar national figures in the history of our country. Such quotations reiterate the theme that the independent farm freeholder is the bulwark of American democracy. However, this brand of democracy was never referred to as agricultural democracy.

During the development of industrialism and the consequent growth of the labor movement, the term "industrial" or "economic" democracy came into common usage. It connoted a transfer of the basic principle of political democracy to industrial and economic areas. During the last 75 years much has been said and written about industrial and economic democracy, but it is only within the last decade that the phrase "agricultural democracy" has become a common symbol in speech and writing.

Farm debates of twenties brought on agricultural democracy.

The first McNary-Haugen bill was introduced in Congress in December 1924. Its introduction marked the entrance into national politics, in a big way, of the national farm organizations and of farmers in general, especially those producing the export crops.

Deep-seated social and economic changes caused farmers in the middle 1920's to feel that they were not receiving fair prices for their products nor a fair share of the national income. "Equality for agriculture" became a shibboleth which demanded that the Federal government do for agriculture in the future what, it was contended, was then being done for other groups in our economy.

The vigorous discussion of equality for agriculture continued unabated from 1924 until the passage of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1933. This widespread and rather intense discussion, coupled with the disastrous consequences of the great depression, resulted in a marked change in interests and attitudes of American farmers. The traditional individualistic pioneer attitudes of farmers gave way to a new group interest.

"We are fighting," said President Edward A. O'Neal of the American Farm Bureau Federation in the spring of 1933, "for equality for agriculture. When we get it we will have moved a long way in the direction of agricultural democracy."

To no small degree, the agricultural democracy which I am discussing began with the passage of the first Agricultural Adjustment Act in 1933. That act was the reply of government to the demand of our hard-pressed farmers in the now historic presidential campaign of 1932.

Early in that campaign Franklin D. Roosevelt had emphasized the economic interdependence between agriculture and industry. Subsequently, in his address on the farm problem at Topeka, Kans., on September 14, 1932, he said:

"..... We cannot have independence in its true sense unless we take full account of our interdependence in order to provide a balanced economic well-being for every citizen of the country.

"Industrial prosperity can reach only artificial and temporary heights as it did in 1929 if at the same time there is no agricultural prosperity.....

"If we would get to the root of the difficulty, we shall find it in the present lack of equality for agriculture. Farming has not had an even break in our economic system....."

In the address, Governor Roosevelt outlined a series of principles which later became the foundation for the first AAA. He proposed that the farm-relief program should operate as nearly as possible on a cooperative basis; also, that participation in the plan must be, insofar as possible, voluntary. He felt that the plan should not be put into operation unless it had the support of a reasonable majority of the producers for whom the programs were intended.

Beginning with the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1933, the Federal Government embarked upon a course of establishing a relatively new relationship with the farmers of the United States. Numerous acts were passed whereby the powers of the Federal Government were to be used in improving the farm conditions.

Among the more important of these agricultural acts were:

(1) The Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1933, approved by the President on May 12, 1933; (2) the Soil Erosion Act of 1935; (3) the 1935 amendment to the Agricultural Adjustment Act, which served as the basis for surplus removal activities such as the present food stamp plan; (4) the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, approved on February 29, 1936; (5) the Jones-Bankhead Farm Tenancy Act, under the provisions of which was instituted the present farm security program; and (6) the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, which serves as the basis of the present ever-normal granary farm program.

It is not my purpose to go into a detailed discussion of these acts of Congress or to make a detailed report on their operation. From the standpoint of what I have called current agricultural democracy, however, what are some of the common characteristics of this movement which have implications in current political theory?

The following are valid generalizations:

1. Decentralized administration in varying degrees through community, county, and State farmer committees, elected by cooperating farmers or appointed by the Secretary of Agriculture.

2. The use of referendums in determining certain administrative policies, especially those having to do with quotas, penalties, and marketing agreements.

3. The use of group discussion and other adult education techniques as a means of promoting understanding of the problems and procedures involved in administration of the various programs and referendums.

4. Cooperative planning in program formulation and localization of programs.

Participating farmers administer programs locally.

The importance of the farmer committeeman in the administration of the national farm program is best summarized in the following words of Henry A. Wallace, in his second annual report as Secretary of Agriculture in 1934: 2/

"Farmers themselves largely administer the adjustment programs through county control associations. These bodies help to make as well as to administer adjustment policy. Thoroughly democratic in form and spirit, the associations are effective instruments in economic self-government. . . In decentralizing administrative work, and at the same time creating new channels through which farmer opinion may find expression, the Agricultural Adjustment Act promotes true democracy."

2/ United States Department of Agriculture. Report of the Secretary of Agriculture, 1934, 119 pp. Washington, D. C., 1934, p. 8.

It is estimated that there are between 250,000 and 300,000 men and women who are members of local and county committees having to do with activities and programs of one kind or another in which the Federal, State, or local governments are involved. Probably not more than 8 or 10 percent of them receive any compensation whatsoever. There is, of course, some duplication of membership in this total figure because some farmers serve on two or more kinds of committees.

In the case of the Triple-A program, community committeemen are elected by ballot at a community meeting which all farmers are asked to attend. The present law provides for the election of the county committee at a meeting of duly elected local delegates. The county committee is largely responsible for the administration of the AAA program. There are 3,021 county committees in the United States and 135,000 county and community committeemen.

The Farm Security Administration has about 10,000 local committeemen who assist in carrying forward the rehabilitation loan program. FSA also has 2,911 farm-debt and adjustment committees and about 1,300 county committeemen who make recommendations in connection with Jones-Bankhead tenant purchase loans. Land use planning is active in about 1,200 counties, and there are approximately 72,000 men and women members of county and community committees. The Rural Electrification Administration functions through about 700 Rural Electric Cooperatives having approximately 5,000 directors. The Soil Conservation Service now cooperates with about 250 soil conservation districts and 1,250 legally elected supervisors for their districts. The men and women who are elected and appointed to these supervising committees are usually leaders in their communities. Their neighbors have confidence in them. They have developed considerable aptitude in working with people.

Referendums play important part.

Farm people like to vote. This is shown by the results of some of the more important referendums held since the first years of the Triple-A programs.

Here are some of these referendums, the month and year in which they were held, the number of producers who voted in them, and the percentage of eligible producers voting for the proposals:

Bankhead cotton referendum of December 1934. Out of a total of 1,521,954 votes cast, 1,361,418, or 89.5 percent, voted for the proposal.

Wheat referendum in May 1935. Out of a total of 466,720 votes cast, 404,417, or 86.7 percent, voted for the proposal.

Corn-hog referendum in October 1935. Out of a total of 943,982 votes cast, 816,891, or 86.5 percent, voted for the proposal.

Cotton-marketing quota referendum of December 1940. Out of a total of 918,857 votes cast, 848,428, or 92.3 percent, voted for the proposal.

Tobacco-marketing quota referendums of 1940. Flue-cured tobacco growers voted in July, and growers of burley, dark air-cured, and fire-cured tobaccos voted in referendums held in November. The question in each case was whether marketing quotas for the respective kind of tobacco shall be in effect for one year, three years, or not at all. The following tabulation shows the results.

Referendum		Number of votes cast				Percentage of votes cast		
		For 3 years	For 1 year only	Against quotas	Total ballots cast	For 3 years	For 1 year only	Against quotas
Flue-cured	July 1940	174,779	3,655	24,625	203,059	86.1	1.8	12.1
Burley	Nov. 1940	111,045	4,521	29,523	145,089	76.5	3.1	20.4
Dark Air-cured	Nov. 1940	8,910	235	1,433	10,578	84.2	2.2	13.6
Fire-cured	Nov. 1940	20,109	490	2,697	23,296	86.3	2.1	11.6

In connection with the flue-cured tobacco referendum, it is interesting to note that 86.1 percent of the producers, more than the necessary two-thirds, voted for a 3-year marketing quota in 1940, while a similar 1-year marketing quota proposal was rejected in December 1938 when only 56.8 percent supported it. As a result of developments abroad, the loss of tobacco exports altered the economic position of these producers. The change in voting, between December 1938 and July 1940, illustrates how the referendum method has given the primary producer a voice in his economic affairs.

The referendum procedure is in many respects a modern adaptation of the town meeting. The Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 directs the Secretary to announce marketing quotas for individual farmers when the ever-normal granary, so to speak, is full and overflowing. Before the quotas which limit the amount that an individual farmer can sell without being subject to penalties become effective, a referendum must be held and the procedure approved by a two-thirds majority. Referendums have been held at frequent intervals during the past 6 years. They have always aroused a vital personal interest on the part of farmers, and the turn-out of voters has usually been between 80 and 95 percent of the producers.

Discussion and participation are vital to democratic process.

Much progress has been made during the past few years in the techniques of discussion groups. Farm discussion groups are usually composed of not less than 7 or 8 families and not more than 15 families which meet occasionally or regularly at the homes of the members. They discuss important topics of agricultural interest. The county extension workers usually give guidance to these little discussion groups. Prior to the holding of referendums, group and community discussion is centered on the issues involved in the referendum. For instance, if the referendum question involves cotton, the discussion information will cover the following points:

What are the facts with reference to cotton? What is the program that is proposed? What are the alternatives to the proposal of the referendum? How will the proposal affect the individual farmer's income and the management of his own farm? Why is it necessary that a large proportion of the producers vote in this referendum?

Such topics produce vital and lively discussion.

No attempt is made to control the referendum discussion of farmers as far as Federal administration is concerned. The Government's only interest is that the facts are set forth correctly. The decision must clearly be that of the producers.

It has been found, through experience, that subjects upon which polls have been conducted make lively subjects for group discussion. Several farm papers have recently been experimenting with a kind of "Gallup poll" of farm policy. For instance, Wallace's Farmer and Iowa Homestead established a department and a system of getting a cross section of farmer opinion with reference to agricultural policy and agricultural politics. Last June, this farm paper took a cross section of Iowa farm opinion on the following questions. Results of farmer opinion are given in percentages:

(1) Do you believe Iowa should have a graduated land tax under which an owner of a big tract of land would be penalized on the holding of all land in excess of that required for the liberal support of a farm family?

	Percent
Yes.....	61
No.....	19
Undecided.....	20

(2) If you approve of the graduated land tax, at which point should the penalty start? Should a man be allowed 240 acres of good land but be penalized on ownership of all over that amount? Or what should the limit be? Check the amount of land that man or corporation should be permitted to hold without penalty:

		Percent
(a)	160 acres.....	42
(b)	240 acres.....	34
(c)	320 acres.....	19
(d)	640 acres.....	4
(e)	1,000 acres.....	1

(3) Do you believe that a man who rents a big acreage should be penalized for operation (as distinct from ownership) of land in excess of that required for the liberal support of a farm family?

	Percent
Yes.....	60
No.....	25
Undecided.....	15

The fact that there are differences of opinion, quantitatively expressed, regarding a question upon which a poll has been conducted, seems to make for tolerant and open-minded discussion.

Schools have been held in cooperation with the Agricultural Extension Service for the training of discussion leaders in discussion techniques.

In addition the Department of Agriculture, in most instances in cooperation with the land-grant colleges, has sponsored 3- and 4-day schools of philosophy. The lecturers and discussion leaders of these schools have been recruited from the philosophy, history, and social-science departments of universities and colleges. Usually there have been three lecturers at each school; one from a philosophy department, another from a political-science department, and a third from an economics department. Occasionally there is a fourth from the educational field.

The general theme of the schools this year is, "What Is a Desirable National Agricultural Program?" The first day is given over to a discussion of backgrounds, the second day to the place of government in modern society, and the third day to problems of social adjustments and administration. It is significant that farmer committeemen, field administrators, working in connection with the national agricultural programs, and agricultural extension workers are eager to discuss the more fundamental problems of social science in relation to agriculture and the philosophical background of human values and social ends in farm life.

Land use planning is based upon the definite recognition of the planning process in the formulation of agricultural policy. It is placed between the educational process with its discussion techniques and the administrative process which takes place after broad policies have been formulated. The planning activity brings together, on the community, county, and State level, a group of far-seeing farm men and women who have a great deal of agricultural statesmanship in their make-up, technical experts and educators from the land-grant colleges, and the

administrators of agricultural programs. On the county and State level these groups try to get agreement on the fundamental problems and difficulties which beset their communities, counties, and States. They try to develop plans for attacking these problems and to recommend local adjustments in the national programs so as to make them more effective in reaching the objectives developed through the planning process. This activity is so well organized that plans and recommendations which originate in any community in the United States can pass from the county land use planning committee to the State Committee, to an interbureau committee in the Department of Agriculture, then to the departmental Program Board and to the Secretary of Agriculture.

Agricultural extension work is a cooperative educational enterprise.

The Cooperative Agricultural Extension Service was started in 1914. It represents a truly cooperative approach on the part of farm people, county government, State government, and the Federal Government to carry on educational work among farmers. Its total budget now represents about 32½ million dollars; and there are now employed over 9,000 professionally trained county agricultural agents, county home demonstration agents, county 4-H Club leaders, and State specialists.

Through 4-H Club work the Extension Service has promoted a Nationwide training system for agricultural democracy. This year we have a total membership of over 1 1/3 million boys and girls and more than 150,000 local leaders. Club work not only encourages farm boys and girls to raise better calves, but it also stimulates development of health, sound thinking, and active participation in discussion. It develops tolerance and the spirit of give and take, which are essential in the democratic process.

During its formative period, the Extension Service in its educational work gave major attention to the technology of farming and homemaking. In later years it has decidedly broadened the scope of education to include social and economic aspects of agriculture. It has rendered invaluable services -- educational and otherwise -- to farmers in connection with the farm program. Indeed, too much credit cannot be given to the Extension Service for having laid the foundation and paved the way for the enlarged agricultural program of the past 8 years.

So much for the agencies of government in relation to the current activities of our agricultural democracy. I come now to two activities entirely independent of government. They are of major importance. One of these is the existence and operation of farmer cooperatives. The other is the existence and influence of the general farm organizations.

Farmer cooperatives are playing an important part all over the United States. There is a reasonably steady growth in their membership and in the volume of their business. Their importance as agricultural institutions is emphasized by the fact that in the 1939-40 marketing season there were 8,051 marketing associations, with a membership of

2,300,000; and 2,649 farmer purchasing cooperatives with a membership of 900,000. The marketing associations did a business of $1,729,000 while the purchasing associations did a $358,000,000 business. Considering duplications in membership, about two-thirds of 3,200,000 memberships or 2,133,333, represent individual producers.

Outstanding national farm organizations include the American Farm Bureau Federation, the National Grange, the National Farmers' Union, and the National Council of Farmer Cooperatives. In addition, there are numerous smaller interest groups representing livestock or special commodity producers. Through these institutions the farmer's voice is heard in the legislative halls in Washington and elsewhere.

The influence and effectiveness of these organizations have increased during the last decade. Accurate information as to their membership is not available, but it is estimated that about a third of the farmers belong to some farm organization. As institutions for group organizations, independent of Government, the national farm organizations play an important part in molding farmer opinion and in expressing it before State legislators and before Congress. They are also a great influence in the field of cooperative marketing and general education.

Numerous processes interact in a particular culture or society.

I have hastily outlined some of the new institutions, some of the processes, and some of the older institutions which are involved in the present model of agricultural democracy. Let us now philosophize a bit about what is happening and raise some questions concerning current tendencies.

Democracy can be thought of as a form of government or as a cultural pattern of which the form of government and the political processes are but one aspect. I choose the latter concept rather than the former. This concept of government as part of a cultural pattern parallels closely the pluralistic view of sovereignty as expounded some 24 years ago by Harold J. Laski.[3/] The main idea of this view seems to be that the individual is at the center of things and is linked to a variety of associations of which the state is only one.

The pluralistic view is closely associated with the doctrine of function. The central theme of functionalism as expressed by Ramiro de Maeztu[4/] is that ". . . society ought never to grant powers to anybody except when they are attached to a defined function."

As we have seen, in the agricultural legislation which provides the basis for the present agricultural activities of the Federal Government, the representatives of the people have stated the task to be

3/ Laski, Harold J. Studies in the Problem of Sovereignty. 291 pp. New Haven, 1917, pp. 1-25.

4/ Maeztu, Ramiro de. Authority, Liberty and Function in the Light of the War. 288 pp. New York, 1916, p. 51.

accomplished by the administrative arm of the Government under the Chief Executive. When a citizen feels that the administrative branch deviates from the function assigned or exceeds the authority granted, recourse is had to the courts.

In fact, the Constitution of the United States limits the activities of the Federal Government to the enumerated functions. As we all know, when the Supreme Court is of the opinion that Congress has exceeded its constitutionally delegated authority in any agricultural or other legislation, it will declare such legislation unconstitutional. As long as the functions assigned to the Government are not so broad as to be all-inclusive, the operation of our governmental agricultural machinery would seem to tie in to some extent with the doctrine of functionalism, the pluralistic theory of sovereignty, and the cultural pattern approach.

The best statement of the cultural pattern approach that I have seen recently was made by John Dewey in his anniversary volume, Freedom and Culture.5/ The cultural pattern point of view holds that democracy is a cultural pattern. As such it has a structure which may be varied and a set of processes which are peculiar to this pattern. As far as man is concerned biologically and psychologically, he can have, has now, and has had in the past, innumerable types of culture. A democratic cultural pattern, therefore, involves far more than a system of government and political institutions.

John Dewey has clearly stated this point of view in the following quotation from Freedom and Culture.

"In any case, the idea of culture that has been made familiar by the work of anthropological students points to the conclusion that whatever are the native constituents of human nature, the culture of the period and group is the determining influence in their arrangement; it is that which determines the patterns of behavior, that mark out the activities of any group, family, clan, people, sect, faction, class. It is at least as true that the state of culture determines the order and arrangement of native tendencies as that of human nature produces any particular set or system of social phenomena so as to obtain satisfaction for itself. The problem is to find out the way in which the elements of a culture interact with each other and the way in which the elements of human nature are caused to interact with one another under conditions set by their interaction with their existing environment. For example, if our American culture is largely a pecuniary culture, it is not because the original or innate structure of human nature tends of itself to obtaining pecuniary profit. It is rather that a certain complex culture stimulates, promotes, and consolidates native tendencies so as to produce certain patterns of desires and purposes. If we take all the communities, peoples, classes, tribes, and nations that ever existed, we may be sure that since human nature in its native constitution

5/ Dewey, John. Freedom and Culture. 176 pp. New York, 1939, p. 18-19.

is the relative constant, it cannot be appealed to, in isolation, to account for the multitude of diversities presented by different forms of association.

"Culture as a complex body of customs tends to maintain itself. It can reproduce itself only through effecting certain differential changes in the original and native constitution of its members. Each culture has its own pattern, its own characteristic arrangement of its constituent energies. By the mere force of its existence as well as by deliberately adopted methods systematically pursued, it perpetuates itself through transformation of the raw or original human nature of those born immature."

Applying this philosophy to an understanding of agricultural democracy, we might paraphrase the key sentence in the above quotation this way:

The problem is to find out the way in which the several important elements of a particular rural culture interact with one another.

In a particular rural culture or society there are a number of processes going on all the time -- education, the application of science through production technology, the administrative processes of government, the economic processes of exchange and distribution. These processes are all there, and one of the great weaknesses of the social sciences is that our highly specialized and departmentalized approach and method of teaching make it difficult for us to see realistically our culture as a whole, together with what John Dewey has called its interacting parts.

Robert and Helen Lynd have applied this theory in a realistic fashion in Middletown, and Middletown in Transition. I believe that there is great validity in this approach, and I am disappointed that it does not have more practical adherence.

Most of the studies in economics, sociology, and political science are segmental studies which are made, seemingly, without any conscious recognition of the cultural patterns of which they are a part or, as John Dewey says, of any awareness of their interaction with the other elements.

Philosophically, this democratic pattern fully recognizes the potential and inherent values in the individual. Again, this conclusion is closely allied to the pluralistic view presented by Harold J. Laski,[6/] when he said: "There is no sanction for law other than the consent of the human mind." The freedom of individuals in the democratic pattern is not the freedom of anarchy. It is a freedom involving social responsibility and responsibility and relationships. What men think and do is largely due to a set of attitudes and behavior patterns which are deeply imbedded in the human mind.

6/ Laski, Harold J. Studies in the Problem of Sovereignty. 291 pp. New Haven, 1917, p. 14.

The problem of modern agriculture is to maintain the functioning principles of the town meeting.

Participation is one of the most fundamental concepts or elements of the democratic pattern of culture. Therefore, agricultural democracy, or, more properly speaking, the democratic agricultural cultural pattern, has within it the maximum number of opportunities and institutions for individual participation by the farmer and members of his family. This participation involves both the policy-forming and the administrative functions of democracy. The New England town meeting, in its relatively simple setting of a hundred years ago, was a really fine democratic institution. Everyone could attend, everyone had a vote, policy could be formed through the process of debate and discussion, and an understanding attitude could be developed regarding the administration of government in the town.

Now, the problem of the development of the agricultural cultural pattern is to maintain the functioning principles of the town meeting with 6 1/4 million farmers in a most complicated society of 130 million people. A conscious effort has been made in the various elements of our national agricultural organization to apply this principle of participation which I have just stated.

Cooperative marketing, and purchasing and credit institutions are certainly important elements in agricultural democracy. Witness them in the Scandinavian countries, Switzerland, France, England, and the United States. A study of these cooperatives always indicates that their successful operation depends upon the intelligent participation of the individual members.

One of the best students of agricultural cooperatives in this country recently told me that the best single index of the status of an agricultural cooperative was not its balance sheet but the attendance of its members at the annual and other policy-forming meetings.

The theory, therefore, on which agricultural democracy rests, is that the administration of the farm programs through elected or appointed farm committees, referendums, group discussion, agricultural planning, agricultural cooperatives, and farm organizations, offers not only opportunity for, but encourages and adds prestige to participation in these activities at the community level. I do not mean to imply that the score on participation is very high yet. I hope that it will continue to rise rapidly.

John Dewey expresses another concept in the quotation already given when he speaks of "the way in which the elements are caused to

interact with one another under conditions set by their interaction with the existing environment." Agricultural democracy has to grow out of the existing environment. It cannot be superimposed by any set of agricultural officials or social experts in Washington, or any other center of government or of research and learning.

There is every evidence that while this is a time of great cultural change in agriculture, the outlook for the immediate as well as the longtime future is for a continuation of change. Difficult problems of economic and social adjustment appear ahead. Technology has changed certain aspects of farm life. The impact of the world cataclysm and the prospect of a world in which agriculture will be carried along vastly different lines than heretofore, are likely to bring about an increasing demand for governmental cooperation with farmers.

Under such conditions, one type of democratic framework involves stimulating the democratic process in the local community and on the different levels of government in the States, in the same proportion that development and responsibility are necessarily enlarged on the Federal level.

The various aspects, therefore, of the science of government as one of the elements in our cultural agricultural pattern, are becoming extremely important in agricultural affairs. Political science is the last of the social sciences to be drawn into the agricultural complex. It is a fair question to ask; "What are some of the things that political science can do to foster and help a sound and satisfactory type of agricultural democracy?"

The answer can, in part, be found in the development of agricultural economics during the last quarter century. Agricultural economics gradually emerged from the field of general, academic economics as it was taught 30 years ago. A few rural-minded men in the field of general economics began by turning their attention to the economic problems of agriculture. Two of the pioneers were H. C. Taylor at Wisconsin, and the late George F. Warren at Cornell.

Now, according to our best estimates, more than 1,800 men with training in agricultural economics are working in this field. More than half of these have a master's and doctor's degree. Twelve hundred are engaged in research, administration, and what we call service jobs in the Department of Agriculture; 600 are employed in the agricultural colleges and experiment stations as teachers, and as extension and research workers. There are probably between 400 and 500 rural sociologists with equal academic training employed in the State agricultural colleges. Most of these men were reared on farms, their parents and brothers and sisters now live on farms, and they are still rooted in the farm environment. Many but not all are graduates of the general agricultural course at a land-grant college. This gives them a foundation or background on which farm people can rely with confidence.

With government becoming so important in the agriculture of our Nation, it becomes necessary that we develop a new type of political scientist. These men should be recruited from the farms and should receive the best training that the graduate institutions can give them. There is no reason why a special branch of political science related to agriculture should not be developed in the same manner as rural sociology and agricultural economics have been developed. Indeed, if the present trend is to be continued, there should be within the next decade or so several hundred agricultural political scientists engaged in research, extension work, and teaching throughout the United States.

Research in agricultural economics and rural sociology is being carried on in practically all agricultural experiment stations and in the United States Department of Agriculture. Much of this work is highly specialized and, of course, is perfectly valid as far as the limits of a particular problem are concerned. But even so, there is now great need for an integrated type of research in which specialists in the various social sciences are teamed together. Administration is becoming so important in connection with the agricultural programs that research in the administrative processes and the training of administrators, are becoming quite necessary.

There are several questions of particular interest to political scientists. I should like to raise them in connection with this matter of developing agricultural democracy.

These questions fall into two general categories. First, the processes and institutions of policy formulation and, second, the processes and institutions of administration. What are the tendencies and what is the outlook in these two fields in the future?

There is a pronounced and clear-cut tendency to recognize a kind of integration and cooperative relationship between the various institutions and agencies that are essentially active in policy formulation. We find a growing activity in the field of social research in relation to agriculture, increased extension activity, a rapidly expanding field for discussion and study groups, and far-flung activities on the agricultural planning front. The attitudes of farm people are rapidly changing, and, I believe there is far more open-mindedness in this respect than there was a decade ago.

The problem of the relationship of the expert to farm people is taking on a new and interesting form in land use planning. Here farm people raise fundamental questions about their local problems. These are realistic problems which impinge directly upon their daily lives. In doing so, they call in the technically trained individual to help them. The technician, therefore, appears in the modest role of an advisor and an assister. As a result of the agricultural planning process, more and more farmers are asking for -- almost demanding -- research in connection with their problems. Research performed in response to such requests tends to be both useful and vital. Its

results are translated almost immediately into the policy-making field rather than being relegated into the files of libraries.

We should distinguish program formulation and policy making that are essential to the effectuation of activities authorized by legislative bodies, from policy making that precedes the legislative process.

Speaking very generally, public agencies responsible for program administration must be extremely active in the first field in order to do a good job of fitting the programs in their charge to varying local conditions. In the second field, public agencies are appropriately under many restraints, which do not apply in our democratic society to private citizens or organized nongovernmental groups.

Thus far there has been no serious conflict in the various institutions and agencies involved in policy making. Nothing particularly new has developed in the relationship between this type of policy making and political parties. The general farm organizations seem by general recognition to be the agencies through which farmers express their policy formulation in concrete terms of legislation before law-making bodies. These organizations frequently are in disagreement both as to basic approaches and detailed legislation; but a remarkable degree of tolerance and good will has prevailed, and does prevail, even though there are wide differences of opinion between different farm groups.

Policy making with reference to local government and State government often lags far behind policy making with reference to national affairs. One reason for this is that so many of the pressing economic problems of agriculture are national in scope, and consequently the Federal Government is the place where action and results can be obtained. If the interacting theory I have previously expressed is valid, and if any democratic activity or any increase in the democratic process interacts with other activities, it should not be long before there would be a carry-over of policy making to local and State government in relation to agriculture. Scattered evidence of this is beginning to appear. The problem of the relationship of policy making to administration in many cases requires creative thinking and bold experimentation.

Administrative science looms important.

Democracy needs the most capable, the most efficient, and the most smooth-running administration that present society is capable of giving. Unquestionably a new concept of the science and art of administration is appearing and replacing the older idea that a Government job was a Government job -- that it didn't amount to much anyway, and that the public pay roll provided a much softer berth than a private pay roll. Where new responsibilities and duties are placed upon Government by the wishes of people in a democracy, then Government must do an effective and efficient job of administration.

There are many hopeful signs that this principle is meeting wider acceptance. For instance, the G. L. F., which is the Great Farmers'

Cooperative Distribution Association of New York, has established, in connection with its overhead organizations, a "school of cooperative administration." Its directors believe that it must carry on its business more efficiently than comparable jobs are being performed by noncooperative organizations.

In order to do this, the G. L. F. appreciates that it must train its managers in the best afforded in the field of business administration; that it must educate its members to understand what efficient business administration is; that it must establish a management system whereby its administrators can function as efficient servants of the cooperative system and of members of the co-op. This cooperative organization feels that the educational institutions have not thus far developed satisfactory courses of this kind, and that, until they do, it will be necessary for the cooperatives to maintain their own schools. Coming from a cooperative association of farm people which has no direct connection with Government, this attitude is indeed a most helpful sign.

Within the Department of Agriculture an administrative council has been set up. Important steps have recently been taken to consider the science of administration on an equal basis with the social and biological sciences in agriculture.

Within a decade or so, we shall no doubt look back upon the period through which we have been passing as one in which administrative science was just beginning to get its start. We shall be impressed with the earnest and conscientious manner in which those charged with administrative responsibility have struggled with their particular problems. I expect to see great developments in the application of administrative science in the field of what the different phases of the administrative process are and where they should take place, that is, on the county, State, or Federal level; likewise the responsibilities on each level of administration.

It is quite likely that we shall develop, far better than we have to date, a much more integrated approach and understanding that will greatly minimize frictions between the different levels of Government and the different phases of agricultural administration.

What are some of the pitfalls of agricultural democracy?

What are some of the pitfalls that agricultural democracy, as I have described it, must be careful to avoid in the years to come?

There is the problem of group selfishness. Will all this machinery and development that I have outlined turn out to be instrumentalities to be used for monopolistic exploitation of the urban population? And would there be a tendency toward group selfishness rather than the general welfare? Personally, I do not believe there is much danger of this. Farmers are a minority in the population and the principle of checks and balances operates between occupational groups. I rather feel

that trouble ahead is apt to be the other way around. Since farming is an individualistic, highly competitive industry, it is much more apt to be exploited, perhaps unintentionally, by the other element of society.

Is there danger of conflict within the forces of agriculture itself? Are there irreconcilable social and economic differences between farm laborers, tenants, and sharecroppers, so that the agricultural democracy is not one which embraces the whole of agriculture, but one which embraces one sector -- perhaps the so-called upper half or two-thirds? The question is often raised as to whether or not the more prosperous farmer would, or does, exploit the farm laborer or poorer farmer in spite of all the idealistic emotions about agricultural democracy? Is the tendency away from small farms toward a more capitalistic system of agriculture, involving wider use of finance and financial institutions and less independent farm ownership?

Such questions are very practical questions. They are being asked in the discussions of the community, county, and State land use planning committees every year. The fact that the questions are being asked is an extremely healthful sign. Democracy can offer no simple, quick panacea for many of these problems. But if it is true democracy, the people themselves are realistic enough to recognize the problems, the realities, and all the implications of poverty in agriculture. If they believe in democracy they also have a will to include in their community, State, and national programs, activities on behalf of the poor and unfortunate element of the population as well as the more prosperous and more fortunate element.

It is only within the last few years that the problems of rural poverty have been given adequate recognition in our agricultural educational, research, and administrative institutions. Perhaps the recognition is by no means adequate as yet, but this area is active just the same.

There is also the problem of the relationship of all this activity to political parties and political phenomena. This is a complicated problem, and thus far the policy-forming activity and administrative activity have steered a remarkably clear course as far as intimate relationships with party politics are concerned. In the case of the AAA committees, each community elects its committeemen and its county committee. This is the backbone of the AAA administration, and these committeemen are, of course, elected entirely without political party consideration.

In 1935 it was charged that in certain counties attempts were being made to enlist committeemen and other officers of production control associations in political, semipolitical, and economic movements. In answering this charge, the Administrator of the AAA pointed out that activities of this nature are entirely outside the functions of the county AAA associations; and that the rules under which they are organized specifically prohibit political activity.

The Hatch Act of 1940 is applicable to all members of the field staff of the Department of Agriculture and to all workers in the national agricultural programs who are appointed by the Secretary of Agriculture. By order of the Secretary, the same principle was made to apply to local committeemen when employed on a per diem basis in the administration of the AAA. I am certain that farmers are becoming more and more interested in national politics and in national political issues, but this interest grows out of more civic-mindedness and not out of an attempt to use agricultural democracy as a political element within itself.

I have endeavored briefly to outline some of the major elements and processes in what I have called agricultural democracy. I called it agricultural democracy in contrast to economic or industrial democracy for the same reason that we attached the word agriculture to specific types of phenomena and institutions. I have indicated a concept of democracy which involves a cultural pattern rather than the narrower concept of a form of government. Maximum, intelligent participation on the part of the individual farmer and his family is the very keystone of this democratic pattern. Of course, there can only be maximum participation when there is complete freedom of thought, freedom of speech, and freedom in the democratic sense. But education and tolerance are concomitants of this kind of freedom.

We are living in a time of great social change and this social change, as far as the farm populations are concerned, is expressing itself in great developments, in democratic processes, and democratic behavior. The growth and development of this movement will depend upon the success which it has in meeting the fundamental problems of farmers. Since more and more farmers turn to government to cooperate with them in these problems, the processes of policy formulation and administrative procedure become of real, vital importance. Political scientists have a contribution to make, both as experts and as political philosophers, to this movement, along with the contributions of the economists, the sociologists, and the other social scientists.

In closing, I am reminded of a conversation I had a couple of years ago with a farmer whom I have known in Montana for 30 years. He is now a man of between 65 and 70 and, in economic terms, would be called just a moderately successful farmer. He is not a small farmer; neither is he a large farmer. I expect he has a rather heavy mortgage on his farm. He works hard; he is a rather rugged individualist; he has a little, but not a very deep-seated, grudge against things in general. I said to him, "Well, how are things in your community?" His reply was: "You don't realize how much they've changed in the last 10 years. You don't realize how many people who seemed to be prosperous in the 20's just about went broke. But they're better now. The Government is really doing something to help us farmers, but I don't think it's doing enough. But we have a lot of committees, we have more meetings than we used to have, and we belong to a lot more things. I don't understand it. A lot of things about it confuse me, but much of the old stuff is as truly gone as the buffalo, and I think that something new is going to come out of all these committees, all this talk, and all these things that the farmers and Government are doing together."